

Appl. No. 10/024,967

**Remarks/Arguments**

Reconsideration of this application is requested. Claims 1-10 are in the case. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 2-10 have been added to more fully claim that which the inventors regard as their invention.

A petition for a one-month extension of time in which to respond to this office action and authorization to charge the petition fee to our deposit account are enclosed.

The amendment to claim 1 and newly added claims 2-10 are supported in the specification as follows:

Claim	Support in Specification
1, 6	pages 2-4, paragraphs 008, 0011 and 0012
2, 7	page 3, lines 11-13
3	page 4, lines 1-4
4, 8	page 4, lines 2-4
5, 9	page 6, lines 11-12

**Rejection under 35 USC 112**

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner maintained that the phrase "drying and/or partial curing" basically refers to the same thing by utilizing different names for it and is found to be unclear.

**Response to 112 rejection**

Claim 1 has been amended to replace "and/or partial curing" with "or partial curing". It is believed that this amendment overcomes the 112 rejection.

**Rejection under 35 USC 103**

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson (US 5,313,448) in view of Strittmater et al. (US 3,580,065). The Examiner's arguments for the rejection can be found at paragraph 4 of the office action. Various components of claim 1 were identified, e.g., heating a metal plate up to a predetermined temperature, applying a

Appl. No. 10/024,967

polymer emulsion binder to a substrate, pressing said surface to the heated metal plate, attaching an end of the coated substrate to a tensile measuring device, waiting a period of time to allow for the binder to dry or cure, separating the metal plate from the tensile measuring device at a uniform speed and recording the force required to remove the substrate from the metal plate. Johnson was seen as lacking a teaching to use of a heated platform to heat the metal plate. The Examiner relied on Strittmater et al. for the disclosure of use of a heated platform.

Response to the relection

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the substrate is used in a creping process. Support for the amendment can be found at pages 3-4, paragraphs 0011 and 0012, of the specification.

It is maintained that the instantly claimed invention would not have been obvious based on the disclosure of Johnson in view of Strittmater et al. There are several major differences between the claimed invention and the references cited by the Examiner.

The claimed invention is directed to a method of measuring adhesion of a polymer emulsion binder to a heated surface, wherein the binder is applied to a substrate that is used in a creping process. As disclosed at page 2, paragraph 0006, the adhesion to the metal surface must be enough to enable creping as the coated substrate contacts the creping blade. Adhesion to the metal surface is not permanent.

Applicants saw no reference to polymer emulsion binders in Johnson. The Examiner is requested to cite the specific section of Johnson that discloses the use of polymer emulsion binders.

Johnson is directed to improving the bond strength of bonding agents applied to electrically conductive substrates (col. 1, lines 34-37). The bonding agents are defined at col. 2, lines 33-35, as being "...an adhesive material that is solid at room temperature...". Examples are pressure sensitive adhesives and hot melt adhesives. The bonding to the substrate is a permanent and strong bond to electrically conductive substrates; generally metal substrates or painted metal substrates. A non-conductive substrate, such as glass, plastic or reinforced composite structure, is also utilized for receiving or bonding to a bonding agent (col. 4, lines 46-55).

Appl. No. 10/024,967

Johnson does not teach or suggest use of a polymer emulsion binder for substrates, such as paper and cotton fabric, used in creping processes. The adhesives disclosed by Johnson would not have been used as binders for a substrate used in creping processes.

Strittmater et al. disclose an apparatus for testing laminate bonds, particularly the testing of the degree of adhesion between the copper circuit and the laminated plastic of a printed wiring board.

Neither reference discloses use of a polymer emulsion binder nor its application to a substrate which is used in a creping process. Combining the references would not have resulted in the claimed invention. The claimed invention therefore would not have been obvious based on the combination of Johnson and Strittmater et al. and the 103 rejection of Claim 1 should be withdrawn.

In view of the amendments and arguments made herein, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance and should be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

*Mary E. Bongiorno*

Mary E. Bongiorno  
Agent for Applicants  
Registration No. 36,091

7201 Hamilton Boulevard  
Allentown, PA 18195-1501  
(610) 481-8820